

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/697,826	10/30/2003	Young-Gun Ko	SAM-0449 9264		
7590 03/09/2006		EXAMINER			
Anthony P. Onello, Jr.			CRANE, SARA W		
MILLS & ONE Suite 605	LLO LLP		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Eleven Beacon Street			2811		
Boston, MA 0	2108		DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006	DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/697,826	KO ET AL.
Office Action	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Sara W. Crane	2811
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTOWHICHEVER IS LONGER - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may if NO period for reply is specified a Failure to reply within the set or extensions.	c, FROM THE MAILING DA e under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 siling date of this communication. bove, the maximum statutory period valended period for reply will, by statute, er than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTHOMATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinvill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE to date of this communication, even if timely filed.	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
<i>,</i> — · · ·	2b)⊠ This n is in condition for allowar	ecember 2005. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-46 and</u> 4a) Of the above clai 5) □ Claim(s) is/ar 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-46, 72-9</u> 7) □ Claim(s) is/ar 8) □ Claim(s) are s	m(s) is/are withdrave e allowed. 85 is/are rejected. e objected to.	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers			·
Applicant may not requ Replacement drawing	on is/are: a) acce lest that any objection to the sheet(s) including the correct	r. epted or b)  objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob eaminer. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9		
a) All b) Some *  1. Certified copie 2. Certified copie 3. Copies of the application fro	c) None of: es of the priority documents es of the priority documents certified copies of the prior m the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PT	O-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent		Paper No(s)/Mail D	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant notes that the drawings have not been indicated as acceptable.

Drawing approval, in the sense of formal objections to the drawings, now occurs as part of the pre-exam process, prior to the examiner receiving the case for examination. If there were formal problems with the drawings filed 30 October 2003, the case would not be now available for examination. Also, there seems to be nothing in the file history indicating any problem with the drawings. So the drawings are assumed to be acceptable. As for approval by the examiner, this would be required only where the examiner has made specific objections in the record to the subject matter of the drawings, and Applicant then, for example, submitted new drawings in response. No such objections have been made, and no new drawings have been submitted, so the drawings of 30 October 2003 remain approved, both by the examiner and by the pre-exam processors.

Claims 2-26 have been cancelled.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 27-46 and 72-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2811

In claims 27 and 72, as amended, the limitation "an epitaxial layer . . . extending from the gate dielectric layer in a horizontal direction substantially parallel to the substrate" is not clear. Does this mean that the epitaxial layer extends substantially parallel to the substrate? Or does this mean that the horizontal direction is substantially parallel to the substrate? Applicant argues that the Nishiyama layers 212 (in figure 10) do not meet this limitation because they extend at an angle (page 11 of the remarks, sixth line from the bottom of the page). But the Nishiyama layers 212 have a segment that extends at an angle, and, in addition, they have a segment that extends parallel to the plane of the substrate. So the layers 212 would extend in a horizontal direction (as well as extending at an angle to the substrate), where the horizontal direction is substantially parallel to the substrate. However, the layers 212 would not extend substantially parallel to the substrate, because the part that extends at an angle to the substrate is itself a substantial part of the layer. So it is essential to understand what it is that is "substantially parallel to the substrate." (The examiner would like to adopt the first definition, to define over the reference.)

Also, the designation "insulating sidewall spacer" is not clear. Applicant argues that the portions of the Nishiyama film 215 adjacent to 208 would not be sidewall spacers, because they are, rather, void-filling insulative regions (page 11 of the remarks, third line from the bottom of the page). But isn't a sidewall spacer a void-filling insulative region? How would one distinguish between a sidewall spacer, and any other type of insulator formed along the gate sidewall?

The designation "sidewall spacers having bottom portions" is also unclear.

Would a "bottom portion" be a portion parallel to the substrate? Certainly the void-filling insulative regions of 215 in Nishiyama figure 10 have bottom portions (extending at an angle) which are in contact with the source/drain regions 212.

In claim 72, what is meant by "a gate dielectric layer includes . . . vertical portions"? Layer 204 of the device of Nishiyama figure 10 certainly has vertical portions, contrary to Applicant's assertions. Is the intention to consider the "gate dielectric layer" as only that part of the insulating layer that directly contacts a channel? This would be an unusual interpretion. One usually interprets "gate dielectric layer" in a functional sense, i.e., as a layer which functions (somewhere) as a gate insulator. That is, the "gate dielectric layer" encompasses the entire layer which has the function of a gate insulator.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Crane, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1652.

The supervisor for Art Unit 2811, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Sara W. Crane Primary Examiner Art Unit 2811